

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/829,160                              | 04/22/2004      | Takamitsu Asanuma    | 110108.01           | 5738             |
| 25944                                   | 7590 06/16/2005 |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC<br>P.O. BOX 19928 |                 |                      | NGUYEN, TU MINH     |                  |
|   | A, VA 22320     |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                 |                      | 3748                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |  |   |  | m                   |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
|   |  | Application No.                         | Applicant(s)   |                     |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   |  | 10/829,160                              | ASANUMA ET AL.   |                     |  |  |  |
|   |  | Examiner                                | Art Unit   |                     |  |  |  |
| ·   |  | Tu M. Nguyen                            | 3748   |                     |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DA Period for Reply   | TE of this communication   | appears on the cover sheet w            | vith the correspondence add  | dress               |  |  |  |
| THE MAILING DATE OF  Extensions of time may be avaing after SIX (6) MONTHS from the  If the period for reply specified  If NO period for reply is specified  Failure to reply within the set of | THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY THE THE PROPERTY THE P | R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a | reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely  NTHS from the mailing date of this co  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | /.<br>ommunication. |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to con  | mmunication(s) filed on <u>2</u>   | 25 May 2005.                            |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 2a)⊠ This action is FIN   | <b>AL</b> . 2b) □ .  | This action is non-final.               |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this applica   | ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| closed in accorda   | nce with the practice und  | ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.l   | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |                     |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/ard  | e pending in the applicati   | on.                                     |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above of   | claim(s) is/are with   | drawn from consideration.               |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is.   | Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/ard  | Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected.   |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is  |  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) ar  | e subject to restriction ar  | nd/or election requirement.             |  |                     |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is   | s objected to by the Exan  | niner.                                  |  |                     |  |  |  |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) file  | d on <u>22 <i>April</i> 2004</u> is/are  | : a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obje              | ected to by the Examiner.  |                     |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not re  | equest that any objection to   | the drawing(s) be held in abeya         | ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |                     |  |  |  |
| •   | • ,  | rrection is required if the drawin      | -, ,   |                     |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declar   | ation is objected to by the  | e Examiner. Note the attache            | ed Office Action or form PT  | O-152.              |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §  | 119  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some  | e * c)□ None of:   | eign priority under 35 U.S.C.           | § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |                     |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified co   | pies of the priority docum   | nents have been recèived in .           | Application No. <u>09/904,875</u>  | <u>5</u> .          |  |  |  |
| 3. ☐ Copies of the  | ne certified copies of the   | priority documents have bee             | n received in this National  | Stage               |  |  |  |
| • •   |  | reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).                |  |                     |  |  |  |
| * See the attached d  | etailed Office action for a  | list of the certified copies no         | t received.  |                     |  |  |  |
|   | •  |   |  |                     |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   | (DTO 900)  | A) [ ]                                  | Summany (BTO 442)  |                     |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Notice of References Cited</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Pal</li> </ol>  | (PTO-892)<br>ent Drawing Review (PTO-948   |   | Summary (PTO-413)<br>o(s)/Mail Date  |                     |  |  |  |
| 3) Information Disclosure State Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0525  | ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE   |   | Informal Patent Application (PTC   | )-152)              |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/829,160 Page 2

Art Unit: 3748

# **DETAILED ACTION**

1. An Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on May 25, 2005 has been entered.

Overall, claims 1-3 are pending in this application.

## **Drawings**

2. The formal drawings filed on April 22, 2004 have been approved for entry.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seto et al. (Japan Publication 6-117221) in view of Hirota et al. (Japan Publication 6-159037).

As shown in Figures 1 and 9 and indicated in the translated Abstract, Seto et al. disclose a device for purifying the exhaust gas of an internal combustion engine, comprising:

- a NOx absorbent (20) arranged in the exhaust system, which carries a catalyst (an alkali metal) for absorbing and reducing NOx and an oxidation catalyst (platinum) to absorb oxygen in the exhaust gas, the catalyst absorbing NOx when the air-fuel ratio in the surrounding

Art Unit: 3748

atmosphere thereof is lean and releasing the absorbed NOx when the air-fuel ratio is stoichiometric or rich;

- a catalytic apparatus (17) for purifying NOx arranged in the exhaust system upstream of the NOx absorbent, the catalytic apparatus carries a catalyst (an alkali metal) for absorbing NOx when the air-fuel ratio in the surrounding atmosphere thereof is lean and releasing the absorbed NOx when the air-fuel ratio is stoichiometric or rich; and

- control means (50, 11) for making the air-fuel ratio in the catalytic apparatus (17) rich to release NOx therefrom and purify the released NOx by reduction, and making the air-fuel ratio in the NOx absorbent (20) rich to release oxygen from the oxidation catalyst and thus to cancel oxygen saturation or contamination on the oxidation catalyst of the NOx absorbent.

Seto et al., however, fail to disclose that the NOx absorbent also has a function of a particulate filter.

As shown in Figures 1 and 2, Hirota et al. teach that it is conventional in the art to use a particulate filter (10) which carries a NOx absorber (26) for absorbing and reducing NOx. As clearly illustrated in Figure 2, the particulate filter is a wall-flow device comprising a plurality of partition walls having pores, the partition walls carrying a NOx absorber (26) on the exhaust gas upstream side surface for absorbing and reducing NOx. A controller in Hirota et al. makes the air-fuel ratio in the particulate filter rich to release NOx and active-oxygen from the NOx absorber to purify the released NOx by reduction, and to oxidize the particulates trapped on the filter by the released active-oxygen. As indicated in the translated Abstract, the heating in the NOx releasing and reduction causes elevated temperature in the filter, which induces the trapped soot to ignite easily. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made, to have replaced the NOx absorbent in Seto et al. with the particulate filter taught by Hirota et al., since the use thereof would have reduced harmful soot emissions in the exhaust gas and saved fuel by inducing soot to combust at an earlier time.

## Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the reference applied in the previous Office Action have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that it is improper to combine Hirota et al. with Seto et al. because the combination would place a filter at a location upstream, instead of downstream as claimed, of the catalytic converter (17) in Seto et al. (page 5 of Applicant's Request for Reconsideration), the examiner respectfully disagrees.

It would be more logical for Seto et al. to replace the downstream NOx absorbent (20) in Seto et al. with the particulate filter (10) carrying a NOx absorber taught by Hirota et al. because of a very important consideration. To do this would place a particulate filter at a location downstream of a NOx trap in order to eliminate the possibility of damage to the NOx traps as a result of heat flowing downstream from an assisted filter regeneration cycle.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references (page 5 of Applicant's Request for Reconsideration), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958

Art Unit: 3748

F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as stated earlier, the use of an integral particulate filter/NOx absorber taught by Hirota et al. in Seto et al. would serve to reduce harmful particulate matter emissions in the exhaust gas and to save fuel by inducing particulate matter to combust at an earlier time.

### Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Prior Art

- 7. The IDS (PTO-1449) filed on May 25, 2005 has been considered. An initialized copy is attached hereto.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure and consists of three patents: Hammerle et al. (U.S. Patent 6,823,663), Taylor, III et

Application/Control Number: 10/829,160

Art Unit: 3748

Page 6

al. (U.S. Patent 6,843,054), and Tumati et al. (U.S. Patent 6,871,489) disclose a particulate filter

at a location downstream from a NOx trap. In particular, Taylor, III et al. teach that positioning a

particulate filter downstream of the NOx traps eliminates the possibility of damage to the NOx

traps as a result of heat from an assisted filter regeneration cycle (lines 35-38 of column 18).

Communication

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4862.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**TMN** 

June 13, 2005

Tu M. Nguyen

**Primary Examiner** 

Tu M. Nguyen

Art Unit 3748